MS. WEST: Dr. Joseph Adams?

DR. ADAMS: I'm Dr. Joseph Adams, and I'm representing the State Medical Society and the Coalition for a Smoke Free Maryland, which is a Coalition comprised of the Medical Society, the Heart, Lung and Cancer Society in Maryland, the Medical Society Auxiliary, the Congress of PTAs in Maryland, the Maryland Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Maryland State School Health Counsel, Maryland Association of County Health Officers, and some other groups as well.

I'd like to preface my remarks by just saying a word about how we get reliable information.

Basically, we have to consider the source. This is particularly relevant to these hearings in which we are hearing testimony from the tobacco industry representatives. In a few weeks from now will be the 30th anniversary of the Surgeon General's first report on smoking. In spite of the intervening 30 years and more and thousands of articles, the tobacco industry does not even concede that smoking itself represents

harm to health in any way, and as a source of reliable information representatives of the tobacco industry have become a laughing stock with no credibility left intact.

According to the former Surgeon General, C.

Everett Koop, "The tobacco industry has discredited itself for so many years with outlandish arguments that reasonable discussion with its representatives is no longer possible."

You heard testimony from tobacco industry representatives today which it make it appear as though the representatives are very concerned about the welfare of small business persons and very concerned somehow with some issue that they've raised about possible workplace productivity.

Clearly, I think we all know that the reason they are very concerned about these regulations is because they feel that the regulations will ultimately lead to a decline in sales because of the ultimate decrease in the number of Marylanders who are addicted to tobacco.

Now, talking about involuntary smoking, you've

heard from -- I won't repeat it -- from Jim Repace about the large number of scientific, objective, governmental and medical organizations which have found that environmental tobacco smoke causes lung cancer and lung cancer deaths among nonsmokers.

In fact, only the tobacco industry and the people with financial ties to the industry have ever publicly questioned this finding. No independent body has ever reached the opposite conclusion and, although the tobacco industry has accused the EPA of bias, it is far more likely that it is the tobacco industry's position that is motivated by bias and self-interest.

Involuntary smoking is the third major cause of preventable death after, number one, active smoking by smokers, and number two, alcohol. Cancer mortality from involuntary smoking among nonsmokers alone exceeds the combined mortality of all regulated environmental carcinogens. It is the number one cause of environmental cancer, killing more Americans than all forms of air pollution, water pollution, food additives and radiation combined.

The health risks in involuntary smoking have become common knowledge. In 1986, 81 percent of adults thought that tobacco smoke is harmful for nonsmokers who live or work with smokers. In 1987 and in a separate study, '81 percent thought that people's smoke is harmful to others nearby.

Adoption of 100 percent smoke-free policies to protect workers is a phenomenon completely of the 1980s and 1990s. Aspen, Colorado, passed the first 100 percent smoke-free restaurant ordinance in 1986. Now, local 100 percent smoke-free ordinances are increasing at an exponential rate. Even cities in tobacco producing states such as Greensboro, North Carolina, has passed them.

More offices are protecting their workers from second-hand smoke than ever before. In a 1992 survey, 56 percent of offices were completely smoke-free, compared to 34 percent in 1991 by a separate survey and compared to 7 percent in 1987, compared to 2 percent in 1986.

Why is it that we have seen this dramatic change

across the country promulgated by offices and
businesses themselves? It obviously is because of our
growing awareness of the health hazards of
environmental smoking. The other reason is because of
the expense to employers of workplace smoking.

Conservative estimates of the excess annual costs of an employee's smoking habit are \$300 to \$800 a year. In 1985, Office of Technology Assessment study, it was estimated that \$11 billion to \$35 billion of the annual health care costs are smoking related or 3 to 9 percent of total health care costs.

The same study estimated that smoking related lost productivity costs between \$26 billion and \$60 billion a year of which about 90 percent was for people under the age of 65. A significant proportion of those costs are borne by employers.

The total cost of smoking in Maryland is over \$1.5 billion and the direct health care cost in Maryland alone in one year is \$374 million.

What are the experience of other localities which have limited workplace smoking? In the 1980s, San

Ξ

Francisco prohibited smoking in the workplace if an acceptable compromise between smokers and nonsmokers could not be reached. To attempt to prevent the legislation, there was a front group called San Franciscans Against Government Intrusion funded almost completely by the tobacco industry which unsuccessfully spent over \$1 million trying to defeat it.

After the regulations went into effect, or during the debate, the industry claimed that the law would be expensive to administer, would cause workplace antagonism and would incite litigation.

A published report evaluating the first 12 months experience with this regulation showed that none of the predictions occurred. There were no lethal actions, and the ease with which the ordinance was implemented and maintained was noteworthy.

To wind up, I'm a small business owner and I have smoking employees in my own business and my practice is internal medicine, and our nonsmoking policy of our building is extremely easy to administer. As a matter of fact, it's my understanding that the law in Maryland

says that employees have the right to a 15-minute break for every three hours of work that they do. It's perfectly easy for people to do their smoking, if they wish, during the 15-minute break.

If MOSH passes this regulation, it will be a boon for smokers. The great majority of smokers would welcome it. Four out of five adult smokers want to quit. Most have made at least a serious attempt to quit, and as you've heard from Dr. Stillman, smoke-free ordinances allow as much as 25 percent or more to finally be able to quit.

And among my patients, it's very rare for one of my smoking patients not to want to quit. When one of them tells me that his workplace is going smoke-free, it's usually with some amount of optimism that it will help him in his continuing effort to quit smoking.

That's all I have to say, thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any questions?

I may have to repeat several times and please believe me that I do not do it to hurry anyone through their presentation, but we do have a lot of people

=

MS. MARKS: Good afternoon. My name is Marsha Marks, and I'm with the Maryland Coalition to Stop the Illegal Sale of Tobacco to Minors -- to Children.

And I will be very brief, because I think everything has been covered very well. I want to say that I have been an activist in Montgomery County for about the past 15 years, and I wanted to bring to you the experience in Montgomery County because at that time we had a coalition in which we were able to pass legislation to ban smoking in the workplace, and this has been very effective.

All except for small businesses were controlled by the law. There is even no smoking in automobiles if the nonsmoker feels that is important.

The problem is, it has not covered the small mom and pop restaurants, workplaces. The business community themselves strongly opposed this law, just as they opposed much regulation by government, but they

have been very grateful once this legislation was passed.

As a matter of fact, as a prior speaker said, banning smoking in the workplace is good for businesses and a healthy work force is a productive work force.

The maintenance costs have been greatly reduced.

If you need more studies on that, I think that there

are quite a few available on the reduction in cost.

What I have handed out to you, and if you'll excuse me, I'm not a paid employee. I've been fighting this industry for a lot of years out of my own pocket. This is my spellchecker obviously didn't work today, as you'll see the many mistakes, but I have here on the last pages some information from Michigan in which they were able to ban smoking in the schools, not only as we did in Maryland during the school day, but also after school, because there are a lot of studies showing, as Dr. Repace has shown, that the tobacco remains in the building long after the smoker has departed.

And this is going to be important. Hopefully, you will pass a workplace law which will include schools,

Ē

and therefore visitors to schools will also not be able to smoke in the building, and young children coming in the next day will not have their asthma attacks because the smoke is still in the building.

I wanted to go back to one point too. The employers were very pleased when we passed the workplace smoking bill in Montgomery County because they didn't have to be the bad guys and tell their employees they couldn't smoke. The could just quote the law.

In fact, we found some small businesses were even quoting the law even though they may not have been covered. It really is helpful to businesses, and they will fight you all the way, no government intrusion, but in reality they're the ones that are being helped the most.

Finally, I just want to say as a social worker that young children are very sensitive to pick up the hypocrisy of adults and we know that tobacco smoke is a Class A carcinogen, and it's time for the government to say we don't want anyone exposed to Class A

carcinogen.

We have a lot of young people that go to work at age 15 and it's becoming more and more common, as many of you know, children and young people have much smaller lungs, faster respiratory systems. The toxins are much more dangerous to young people.

I think it's time for you to protect the children of this country, the work force, and everybody else.

And thank you.

Some other members of our Coalition are going to be testifying next week in Frederick, and if you are at all interested in hearing from some of the people in Montgomery County as to how our workplace laws are working, I'd be glad to get you some more people to talk to.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you.

Any questions?

MS. MARKS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you very much.

MS. MARKS: Oh, I just wanted to say I also included another study that I don't think was included

21

I have the nuts and bolts and day to day

experience of administering a smoking policy in the agency. In 1989, we went from an agency where there was smoking at will, to banning smoking by vote in various offices and parts of cafeterias and so forth to then progressing to banning smoking within the facility to, this past July, where we not only banned smoking in all facilities and buildings and vehicles of the agency, but also moved our smokers away from the entrances to provide for a smoke-free corridor.

I have to tell you that that has gone very well.

Contrary to what you may believe, the smokers comply

very, very well. We have very little problems with

calls. Usually what happens when we have expanded the

policy another step, so to speak, we get a lot of calls

for the first two weeks prior to the date of the ban

going into place. We get a number of calls in the week

after, and simply the calls are: what are the limits,

where do I go, and how far do I have to stand away, and

so forth?

And once the ban is in place for a couple weeks, the calls virtually disappear.

So I have a good distinction job of not having the 1 problems on a day-to-day basis that have been alluded to as the headaches of an employer and so forth. 3 think that this can be implemented. I commend the Secretary and I say to you as a health care professional that I think this is a good move for the state of Maryland. It has worked in our agency. Our 8 policy has been copied by the CIA, the DIA, the State Department almost verbatim. And they are experiencing and talking to my counterparts with those agencies the 10 same type of situations that I have. 11 Once the policy is in place and once everybody 12 stands the limits of the policy, there are very little 13 problems in administering it. And I await your 14 15 questions. CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any questions? 16 MR. LAWSON: Just one quick question. 17 I noted you could use the nicotine patch reference. 18 19 MR. AMASS: Yes. MR. LAWSON: Did you underwrite the cost of that?

> FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. Court Reporting Deposi D.C. Area 261-1902 Depositions Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

I would have thought you were going to

20

21

MR. AMASS:

ask that and I was, in fact, going to allude to it because I heard your question earlier.

The Department of Defense, which we are an agency of, has mandated that we conduct smoking cessation programs. We have conducted smoking cessation programs since 1988, with the advent of the nicotine patch, we investigated the possibilities of using it and decided to go ahead and use it in conjunction with our smoking cessation program, which is run by a three-person team. It has a psychologist, a medical doctor and a pharmacist on it. They run an eight-week program, and we were going to use the nicotine patch.

All of a sudden, we had budget restraints as the federal government did and has had. And I wrote to one of the companies that produce nicotine patches, to the president of the company, and they were so impressed by the program that we put together that they donated the patches to us.

So we have been using them for nearly a year now, but at no cost to the federal government because they were donated to us.

=

=

firearm or anything of that sort, you would be in violation of a governmental regulation and you would be subject to the penalties for doing so.

Usually, it has a five-step process. The first step is an informational process where your supervisor says to you, do you know that you're in violation of this ban, the regulation of the agency you're not supposed to smoke here or there? And that has no administrative weight whatsoever. It doesn't go in the employee's record. It doesn't go on their file or anything. There's no written notation made of it.

The second step is a written warning with counseling plus a written warning which would go in the employee's file. And then it moves up to there through hearings and so forth to possible dismissal.

We have never, never gone past the first step. We have never gone past the step of simply telling an employee, are you aware of the fact that you're smoking in a place that's restricted.

MR. NOBILE: When you were preparing the ban itself before the language was put on paper and put

I don't have anything else to add to the scientific debate of that issue except to say that I would hope that it's time and you can now move past trying to answer the question, is secondary smoke dangerous for us, and get on to what to do about it.

Let's see. What else do I need to say to you? As a screen printer and a machinist I've worked in shops all my life where I've needed to deal with, you know, a lot of different ways various occupational hazards and consider myself, along with a lot of my coworkers, fairly expert at a lot of different ways of addressing dangers to us in the workplace, anywhere from getting help from MOSH, which we do sometimes, to just developing allies to try to get something changed in the workplace, to making deals with people who are presenting a danger to us and trying to get something to happen that way.

We could use help around smoking the same way that we could use it, have used it in other ways. What I mean is to have a regulation to back up, you know, the fact that it is dangerous and we need to do something

about it.

Right now I work in a shop that has 40 employees, and there's only two of us that don't smoke, so it's a little different from other places where I've worked where the balance has been different and I guess just some anecdotal stuff about how difficult it is to approach, trying not to be exposed to smoke while I'm working in that kind of a place.

You can imagine, especially since the four partners that own the business all smoke too, and at any given time many of the people I work with can be approached by several people who are smoking in very close quarters and often people of a higher rank than us where we don't have a lot to say about what they're doing. Or, if we do say something about what they're doing, we risk potentially our job, but other kinds of difficulties at work.

And that's what I mean by we could use some help outside of kind of the social ways that you might deal with that kind of a danger if you're presented outside of a workplace. Some of those ways don't work so well

in the workplace.

Another thing is smoking is kind of, in a broader way, a socially accepted thing to do as opposed to some of the other dangers that I might have had to deal with in the workplace. I don't have to argue too long with someone to get them to stop working with open, you know, basins of trichlorethylene around me, but it's very different if I try to get them to stop smoking around me.

Smoking is also done by people -- it's kind of stress-related, and so agreements I might make such as I did when I took this job where I knew I'd be around a lot of smokers, I made agreements conditional on my taking the job that they wouldn't smoke in the room where I worked when they're working next to me.

And that was great, and they were very nice about it and very agreeable, but as soon as the stress level reaches a certain level, as soon as they're irritated with me, as soon as any number of factors happens, those agreements are out the window and I'm exposed.

So basically for me when in the workplace, and

Ξ

4

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

MR. BURKHARDT: Thank you very much for giving me

21

the honor of speaking at this time.

If you will please refer to the submission I handed in to everybody. It's my written statement and also an article in the <u>Washington Post</u>, also a pamphlet called "BREATH."

My name's Keith Burkhardt. I'm a resident of Owings Mills, Maryland. I'm a former waiter, have worked at several restaurants over a two-year span. I am now well-informed on the issue of second-hand smoke and it's dangers. I have decided never to work in a restaurant again until it is smoke-free. In my past experiences as a waiter, my throat got sore frequently as I was exposed to second-hand smoke. I can't expose myself to a cancerous substance in order to improve my income.

I feel safer working in a smoke-free environment.

It is hazardous to work in a restaurant, even if

it has a nonsmoking section. A nonsmoking section and
a smoking section are separated by a partition,
imaginary line or by a table. There is no way to

protect customers and employees from second-hand smoke.

-

Michael Siegel of the Centers for the Disease
Control and Prevention's Office on Smoking and Health
has done a research on second-hand smoke. He said that
nonsmoking section in restaurants are a failure because
of the law of physics. Second-hand smoke tends to
spread into all areas, so for the employee, he or she
will suffer.

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Bar and restaurant workers breathe in three to five times as much second-hand smoke as other workers. It's like smoking one and a half to two packs a day.

It seems that restaurants and bars are trading off the health of the worker and employee for supporting the addiction of the smoker. Most restaurants and bars care for making money, not creating a safe and healthy environment for all people of all ages.

In the past, lawsuits have been brought up by employees who were exposed to second-hand smoke. In California, a waiter won an \$85,000 settlement after suffering a heart attack caused by involuntary exposure to tobacco smoke in a restaurant. If smoking is still permitted in Maryland, lawsuits will make the news in

the future.

1

18

19

20

21

I would like to read a partial listing of smoke-2 free restaurants in Maryland: Jerry's Subs and Pizza, 3 Ellicott City; Boston Chicken, Ellicott City; Wendy's, Columbia; Little Alexander's Pastaria and Bakery, Ellicott City; Bullock's Airport Inn, Westminster; 6 Puffins, Pikesville; Wendy's, Owings Mills; Burger 7 King, Reistertown; McDonald's in Timonium, Towson, Hunt 8 Valley and Fullerton; Borders Expresso Bar, Towson; 9 Chuck E Cheese Pizza Time Theatre, Glen Burnie; 10 Mealey's Inn, New Market; Wendy's in Laurel and Lanham; 11 California Pizza Kitchen, Bethesda; Amalfi Ristorante 12 Italiano, Rockville; McDonald's, at least two of them 13 in Hagerstown; the Inn at Walnut Bottom, Cumberland; 14 McDonald's in LaVale and Cumberland; Penn Alps, 15 Grantsville; Deer Park Inn, near Oakland; and at least 16 one Fox's Pizza in Garrett County. 17

This list shows that these restaurants do care about the health of customers and employees.

I'm going to talk about a restaurant that's smokefree and successful. The Carlyle Grand Cafe near

Ξ

Arlington, Virginia, is a prime example. It went smoke-free in early 1993 and business is booming.

Sales are up 35 percent over last year as a result of being smoke-free.

Tony Ford, general manager, made his restaurant smoke-free because of the EPA report. He is genuinely concerned about his employees and customers.

I personally visited Carlyle Grand Cafe back in October and the restaurant was packed. I couldn't get a seat at the bar. The wait for a table is 45 minutes. I did dine there the next day and thoroughly enjoyed the smoke-free environment.

This restaurant enjoys a competitive advantage over ones in nearby Maryland and Washington, D.C. If Maryland has smoke-free restaurants, then Maryland will draw in customers from bordering states and Washington, D.C.

Since EPA has classified second-hand smoke as a Group A carcinogen, there is no safe level. This is why wall smoking should be banned in all businesses, especially restaurants and bars. Banning smoking by

employees isn't going to protect anyone's health. The ban must include everyone who walks in the door of businesses in Maryland. 3 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you. 5 Any questions? Thank you, Mr. Burkhardt. 6 Ira Fader. MS. WEST: MR. FADER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman, I 8 will speak on the other side at this point. 9 We have I run a very small business. 10 approximately 38 employees. We're not a GE. We're not 11 a NSA. We're not a Westinghouse. 12 Over 100 years ago my grandfather started Fader's 13 catering to the cigar smokers of Baltimore, corner of 14 Baltimore and Gilbert Avenue. That location and the 15 small cigar factory on Water Street were burned down in 16 the Baltimore fire of 1904. The store was reopened a 17 year later in 1905 at 210 East Baltimore Street, where 18

My father worked in the company until his death in

it remained until 1972, when I moved it to its present

location at 107 East Baltimore Street.

19

20

21

1959 as did my mother, who entered the business out of necessity during the depression. I have owned the company since my father's death.

Presently, the company has six locations in and around Baltimore, including one in Annapolis.

Fader's is a tobacconist. Simply stated, we sell premium cigars, custom-blended pipe tobacco. Our customers are smokers, and in order to effectively cater to that individual, most of our sales personnel also smoke. Although it's not a prerequisite of employment that our salespersons smoke -- and we do have employees who do not smoke -- the vast majority do smoke.

They enjoy smoking, whether it be a pipe or a cigar, and they use their expertise to help our customers find just the right tobacco blend or a cigar to fit their individual tastes.

Today there are approximately 55 million adults who enjoy tobacco in one form or another. I do not know whether you smoke, nor is it any of my business, but it is my business to accommodate my smokers to the

high standards and atmosphere that we have achieved.

1

6

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

This cannot be done if my employees are not 2 permitted to smoke on the job. I can fully appreciate 3 that smoking on the job can be a safety hazard in 4 certain situations evidenced by the tragic school fire 5 that apparently prompted part of this proposed regulation. On the other hand, I know of two 7 individuals who were burned to death in their car 8 following an accident when they were unable to extricate themselves from their seat belts in time to 10 11 get out.

Certainly, the effort to get greater seat belt usage would not be lessened because of this one incident.

Government is becoming more and more intrusive into how business is being run, especially small In our society of free enterprise, let business. management determine how to operate. If they do not operate to their clients' and customers' satisfaction, they will not succeed and they will not remain in business.

My understanding is that government's place to help business, not to destroy it. This proposed regulation to prohibit employee smoking in the workplace would surely put my company and every other tobacconist out of business. I think I can speak for most small businesses who are inundated with government regulations today to a point where so much time is spent in trying to accommodate these regulations and what have you that they could far better operate their businesses were it not for all this government intrusion.

I'm glad to answer any questions.

Yes, sir?

MR. LAWSON: Beyond the customer smelling, pinching for moisture of pipe tobacco, do you have occasion where customers will ask for a small sample to light up a pipe and would, in fact, smoke in your workplace as part of the purchase transaction?

MR. FADER: They will, in looking for a blend, they will try this or try that or try another one until they can find what they feel is the right blend for

them.

MR. LAWSON: What you say is they may purchase samples of different blends and try it, but would they actually take a portion of a pipeful and light up each of the blends in your establishment?

MR. FADER: It's part of the service that we give.

MR. LAWSON: Okay.

MR. FADER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. PATRICK: You said your employees have to smoke as part of the job? In what context do the employees smoke?

MR. FADER: No, I said they do not have to smoke, but at the same time the vast majority of our employees do smoke. They enjoy smoking. And it's, you know, our business is tobacco. We are in the cigarette business. We are in the custom blended pipe tobacco and cigar.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any other questions? Well, thank you, Mr. Fader.

MR. FADER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: We appreciate your comments.

MS. WEST: I'll call on Norman Astel and

representatives of the Maryland Farm Bureau.

MR. ASTEL: Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, I'm Norman Astel with Maryland Farm Bureau. I'm not going to say anything, but I'm going to turn it over to three tobacco producers.

Thank you.

MR. PHIPPS: Thank you, Norman.

Chairman Marshall, members of the Board.

I'm Mike Phipps. Earl Griffith and Oscar Grimes were not able to be here. One was here earlier, but on a pretty day like this it's hard for a farmer to stay indoors, and I do have Mr. Buddy Bowling and Mr. Steven Walters from the Southern Maryland Tobacco Board who will make comments.

As Norman said, I'm a farmer. Our families down in southern Maryland have been growing tobacco since 1600s. Tobacco is the major reason we had the state of Maryland. It was used as currency in the early days.

No one paid me to be here. I'm not defending any organization. I don't have any statistics with me.

I'm not a scientist, thank God, but I'd just like to

give some personal insight.

This is the first time I've spoken before a Board so you'll have to bear with me.

Our family grows tobacco and I don't smoke. I never tried it. I tried chewing once and I swallowed some and that took care of me.

(Laughter.)

MR. PHIPPS: If that sounds like I'm not supporting my industry, but we used to have dairy cattle, I and I don't like the taste of milk either, so --

I came here basically because, no harm to the author of this, I think this is a bad proposal. There is a great difference between being concerned about health and being zealous. The Big Brother mentality seems to be present here, in my opinion, based on the wording of this proposal.

What is a workplace? Does that include a farm employee out on a hundred-acre field driving a tractor? A carpenter out in the construction site, whether it be in the city somewhere or out in a subdivision building

a home? A salesman in his car?

I think we need to have some answers to this as well.

There are many people who shouldn't smoke, no doubt about this, and I understand this is a very emotional issue with many; however, there are examples of folks -- I talked to an 85-year-old fellow the other day that's been smoking all his life. I told him you're supposed to be dead by now, but he didn't believe me.

I've also seen four-year-old people have lung cancer that never smoked a cigarette in their life.

If you can't tolerate smoking, you shouldn't smoke. The same thing is true of cholesterol. There are people that have trouble with cholesterol. They can look at something fattening and their cholesterol level goes up. Others can eat lard almost every day and have no problem at all. I've got an 88-year-old grandfather ate fat meat all his life and he's still going strong.

Same is true of sugar diabetes, cirrhosis of the

liver.

But does this mean that the state, for example, with cholesterol, if we, as a precedent with this, would we go into requiring vegetarian diets for all employees in the state at the workplace? Or should the state require all of us to be, as the gentleman said that talked about Seventh Day Adventists? I don't think so. I hope not.

I've always been in favor of designated smoking areas. I don't like smoke in my face, but I think that is a decision of the employer and not the state and with that, I'll just leave you.

I think the biggest thing we need to look at is all these automobiles, people building all across the state taking farmland away and driving 50 million miles to work. If I had my choice, I'd rather have everybody in here smoking a cigarette or a pipe than have one automobile in here running.

And with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Buddy Bowling.

MR. BOWLING: Mr. Chairman, members of the

committee, my name is Gilbert Buddy Bowling.

I am a tobacco farmer. I am also affiliated with the Tobacco Warehouse. I am the third generation of the Bowling family that has been involved in tobacco production. I have a few statistics too. I don't know whether you're aware of them or not, but I am going to give you them to make them part of the record.

There are 1,300 farms in southern Maryland, 10,000 acres of tobacco grown on southern Maryland soils, \$204 million industry. We have six major buyers. Most of those buyers are export buyers, and we do have some domestic buyers. Tobacco generates \$140 million in taxes in the state of Maryland.

And I'd just like to make a few comments in reference to smoking in the tobacco warehouse. I think this could -- if this bill does pass, it could create tremendous economic burden on tobacco warehouse owners because there are employees that do smoke. There are people that come in there and do smoke.

With that, I'd like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. I'd be certainly glad to

address any questions if you have any. I will turn it over now to Mr. Steve Walter.

MR. WALTER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee.

My name is Steven Walter. I'm president of the Southern Maryland Tobacco Board, and that is a nonprofit farmer board that promotes tobacco and mainly export because we are -- Maryland Tobacco is an export-based commodity basically.

I'd like to say -- I won't repeat what they've said, and you have my comments written there -- other than I'd like to say it would be right hard for us to police smoking on a farm in particular. We have employees out. I mean, my farming operation covers, oh, I don't know how many square miles, and when you've got somebody out there you don't know whether they're smoking or not, and I would like to know, for one thing, would I be subject to a fine if an employee is caught smoking?

And the employees that we have, a lot of them don't have many pleasures in life -- I hate to say this

===

-- because we can't pay them but so much, but what some of them do do is smoke. It would be almost ridiculous to say on a tobacco farm you can't smoke. That's my main point. 4 The other thing I'd like to say is, how many 5 people here know what the number one cause of death is in the workplace? It's from lead, generally fired from That was just published here not too the end of a qun. long ago. 9 All right, thank you very much for your time. 10 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any questions? 11 MR. QUIDAS: You said 1,300 farms. Is that 12 tobacco farms? 13 MR. BOWLING: Tobacco farms in Southern Maryland. 14 I'd also like to bring it to the Committee's attention 15 that we're talking about, in terms of the counties, 16 Charles, St. Mary's, Anne Arundel, Prince George's, and 17 Calvert County. 18 MR. NOBILE: Is that the only cash crop for this 19 20 land? MR. BOWLING: No, that's not the only -- that's my 21

major cash crop though. I do raise other commodities such as corn, soy beans and a few vegetables, and I do have some livestock. MR. NOBILE: Also for you? MR. PHIPPS: Tobacco is our major crop, yes, sir. 5 It's a major crop in southern Maryland. 6 MR. NOBILE: I'm talking about you personally. 7 MR. PHIPPS: Yes. We have some cattle too. Of 8 course, meat will kill you too if you eat it long 9 You know, eggs and everything will kill you. enough. 10 MS. GILFORD: I'd like to know, material you 11 presented here, the statistics, have you furnished 12 those to us in writing? 13 I had them MR. BOWLING: No, I don't, ma'am. 14 written down, but I will certainly provide them to you. 15 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: We'd appreciate that. 16 MR. BOWLING: Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Another question? 18 MR. QUIDAS: One more question. What -- most of 19 those 1,300 farms, what would you say that the 20 percentage that tobacco encompasses? 21

1	MR. BOWLING: I would say 80 percent.
2	MR. PHIPPS: A large percentage.
3	MR. WALTER: Some of them are diversified as Buddy
4	said. We are. We represent it represents about
5	half of our income on my farm. We work about 1,200
6	acres of crops. We also grow vegetables and grain, but
7	it provides about half the actual net income.
8	MR. QUIDAS: So you think it would be at least
9	half on most all farms?
10	MR. WALTER: Probably a lot of them one thing they
11	do grow is tobacco. That's their main crop, and I'd
12	say half. It's probably about 80 percent of a lot of
13	them, 80 t 90 percent as you spread them out on the
14	farms of southern Maryland.
15	MR. PHIPPS: Certain counties are higher than
16	others.
17	CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you very much.
18	MR. PHIPPS: Thank you.
19	MS. WEST: Thomas Saquella.
20	MR. SAQUELLA: Mr. Chairman and members of the
21	Board, my name is Tom Saquella, and I'm president of

PREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

=

Maryland Retail Merchants Association.

We've already distributed a statement. I think it's been distributed already. It was dropped off earlier this morning.

We have some serious reservations about the proposal. I'll try to be very brief, just summarize it. Some of my points have already been made.

Our first concern is, I think the proposal as it's presently drafted puts the retail employer in a very difficult, if not impossible, situation.

The regulation refers to "in the place of employment." If one follows the Workers' Compensation law, that includes parking lots, loading docks and delivery trucks. I don't see how a retail employer or any employer can be responsible if an employee smokes in a parking lot at his or her store or if even at a large mall where you would still come under the jurisdiction of the employer in terms of Workers' Compensation law. I think that same theory would extend to this proposed regulation.

There's also no flexibility. We already heard

from Mr. Fader. That was one example I was going to use, a tobacco store. Another example that I think 3 you've got to be concerned, especially when you're talking about small employers, and about 80 percent of 5 my members employ ten or less people. That's the 6 nature of the industry so essentially speaking for 7 small employers you've got the situation where a father 8 permits his son to smoke in the home but not in the workplace, and you -- I have a lot of literally ma and 9 10 pa stores which are family run, all the family 11 participate as employees with the father or mother as 12 owner.

There are all sorts of legal questions. I know earlier this morning you had some comment about the federal MOSH law and OSHA law. I should point out that there is a specific law in Maryland statute prohibiting smoking in the retail store, but that law also specifically exempts the work areas of retail stores that are nonaccessible to the public.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I would question -- there's some legal question as to whether you can use a regulation, a state regulation

to override an existing state statute. I would certainly say even if that is legal sufficiency, that it's not wise policy and such an issue should be brought to the General Assembly to reconcile.

I think my major point is, and this is going to allude to a couple other people who have come before me, is I really think the proposal is somewhat unnecessary. We've heard from large employers who are already doing this already, and, by the way, as those proposals were described to me, they would all be in violation of this proposed regulation because they send the employees outside the building but still within the workplace and the employment place, so they would be in violation of this regulation.

The research network, the polling we had done, that's been explained to you earlier. I think most business people feel there's enough regulation and a lot of employers are already moving in to provide both smoking and nonsmoking areas for their employees, and they recognize that. It's a question, I think, mostly of lifestyle and sound employee, employer relations.

1	And I think government getting involved would just
2	be counterproductive, so no other points I really want
3	to make, but I would emphasize I think when you're
4	thinking about this you've got to look at the small
5	employers there are many, many thousands of
6	different small employers and try to bring it back
7	to their level as to how this can be done because there
8	are fines, as you all know, and I think it would be an
9	administrative nightmare and cause a tremendous
10	negative reaction in the employer community.
11	CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Saquella.
12	Any comments, questions?
13	Thank you very much.
14	MS. WEST: Margareta Crampton.
15	MS. CRAMPTON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.
16	Thank you very much for allowing us the opportunity to
17	testify today on the proposed regulation.
18	I'm Margareta Crampton, legislative representative
19	of the Maryland state and D.C. AFL-CIO.
20	There is a number of things that I'd like to
21	discuss today. You have already received the statement

that we have submitted, so I'm not going to go down it in its entirety. I'm just going to breeze through it if it's okay with you.

First, what I do want to say is that the unions, of which we are a part of, have a legal responsibility to represent the interests of all their members, the workers who smoke and nonsmoke, and it's not our position to tell them whether they can or can't smoke. Now the unions are being faced with legislation or unilaterally imposed employer policies that forbid smoking on the job and infringe on the rights of workers who smoke.

The AFL-CIO believes that issues related to smoking on the job can best be worked out voluntarily in the individual workplaces between labor and management in a manner that protects the interests and rights of all workers and not by a legislative mandate, as a previous speaker, Mr. Amass, has spoke of.

The AFL-CIO is committed to improving the working conditions and health of all our workers. We urge our affiliated unions to continue their efforts to reduce

臺

workplace hazards and to provide voluntary assistance and education to workers who smoke as part of the ongoing comprehensive program to improve the health of all our workers in the state of Maryland.

The Maryland State and D.C. AFL-CIO is pleased that this advisory board is turning its attention to the indoor air environment. However, after reviewing this proposed regulation, we have concluded that it does not adequately provide the protection working men and women need in the indoor work environment.

б

The average worker spends about 90 percent of his or her time indoors. Given this statistic, it is vital to look at the studies conducted by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health which reported that only 2 to 4 percent of the indoor air quality problems could be traced to tobacco smoke.

Restricting a regulation to only tobacco smoke is discriminatory and ignores the fact that many of our workers are dangerously exposed to a range of other hazards and provides no relief to thousands of working men and women. At the initiative of the National AFL-

CIO, federal OSHA is preparing a standard on indoor air quality. Last year the agency accepted more than 1,200 responses to its request for information on the indoor air quality issue. It is unclear what solution to indoor air quality federal OSHA will propose, but it could preempt a state OSHA standard on indoor air quality.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Action by Maryland MOSH on a lesser standard would be premature and create a confusing, possibly even conflicting, approach to the problem.

We believe this duplication should be avoided.

And I'm only going to read one more statement and then I'm going to touch on four issues that I think I need to touch on, and then I'm going to turn it over to a couple of our experts.

We encourage the Board to make a real difference for the health and safety of Maryland workers and to undertake a more comprehensive effort to address the entire scope of the indoor air quality problems while respecting the right of workers.

The things that I want to touch on is four issues.

Ē

A smoking ban ignores the broader problems of workplace indoor air quality. A study by the National Institute of Occupational and Safety and Health -- which I just stated a moment ago -- reports that only 2 to 4 percent of the indoor air quality problems could be traced to tobacco smoke.

This was reenforced by a study done last year by the American Federation of Government Employees which concluded that 95 percent of the Social Security Administration workers that are right here in Baltimore and many who work daily and regularly in the building who say they experience work-related illnesses, attributed to the indoor air quality. And it's unusual but that building is smoke-free. You can't smoke in the building, so there's a little bit of a conflict there as to how that problem could exist there then.

Also, the broader indoor air quality alternatives and it's not a single-source solution, and we should look at what that should be.

Also, a fine assessed against violators is an unrealistic solution. The Maryland OSHA standard would

levy a \$5,000 fine against employers violating the rules. You're putting employers in a position of policing what their employees are doing on the worksite rather than continuing to let them be productive and let the work go as it should.

We have a concern with that.

Different workplace environments require different needs, and these solutions are best achieved when workers and management set policy.

OSHA, as I said, is preparing a standard on the issue which would preempt whatever Maryland would do. Therefore, the federal OSHA has been working on a comprehensive indoor air quality standard, and is supposed to be coming up with what we have heard shortly in the future, near future.

With the Maryland OSHA, I think we should wait for the federal standard to be published before moving forward. The federal OSHA standard would be very broad dealing with all air constituents and expected to make a state standard unnecessary.

Last but not least, labor-management collective

bargaining is the solution. The OSHA proposal is an unnecessary and inappropriate intrusion into the area of employer, employee relations. Most of the people spend most of their waking hours working and all of a sudden now we're going to mandate to them what they can do on their company time while they're working to try to make a living to pay taxes in this state.

I think this is wrong, and I think it needs to be looked at a little closer. I thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you today.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you.

MS. CRAMPTON: And I'd like to now turn it over to Neil Wilford from the sheet metal workers.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Mr. Wilford.

MR. WILFORD: Thank you.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

My name is Neil Wilford. I'm the business representative of the Sheet Metal Workers, Local 100, which covers the entire state of Maryland.

I've served an apprenticeship and been a journeyman and taken extensive courses for 32 years with the Sheet Metal Workers.

I'd like to first thank MOSHA and Brother Koellein who's always been there. I'm a construction worker and we have the major causes of death in all the occupations, so I know what safety is all about, believe me, and I'd like to thank all of his staff too.

But one of the things I'd like to say is the Sheet Metal Workers have been very interested for years because of the Legionnaire's disease and all the other things, not just smoke, but, as Ms. Crampton said, a lot of other things. We're concerned about the indoor air quality.

Now, I've been involved, like I say, for 32 years. That fellow that had the screen up there pointing that little picture at all the things there, let me just give you some facts in regard to that.

Them little boxes that were turning the air around in that air, that's circulating air, not changing air. Changing air means just what it says, to take all of that air out of the room, exhaust it outside and bring fresh air in. When he said that the thing was sparkling up the dust, he was not changing the air. He

was getting air samples from the same air that was in there.

And also about the doorway thing, if people walk through the smoke, they're going to breathe it in. The air is supposed to come out of the doors. If it's not, it's not a proper system because if that was the case, every time the door opened, the heat would come out of the building -- I mean, the cold air would come in as a reverse, as the heat is supposed to come out. So any smoke is going to be blown out of the door. It's not sucked into the door.

So they're just simple heating and ventilating techniques.

And what we have done is through our international we have developed studies to take and have clean indoor air quality. I would like to ask Mr. Alex Willman, who's from the National Energy Institute as a division of the Sheet Metal Workers International who is the expert in the field.

Thank you.

MR. WILLMAN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of

the Board. My name is Alexander Willman. I am a licensed Maryland state professional engineer. I was born in the state of Maryland and my first home was purchased in the state of Maryland.

I've been in the heating and air conditioning industry for 20 years and my purpose today is to represent the National Energy Management Institute which is a nonprofit labor/management trust of the sheet metal industry.

Both here in Maryland and on a national scale, the National Energy Management Institute, NEMI, has been actively involved in the identification of practical solutions to indoor air quality problems. During this time, we've investigated hundreds of actual buildings, not theoretical buildings that you can draw straight lines on, but actual buildings.

We concluded from this that the primary cause of worker indoor air quality complaints focuses on inadequate ventilation system operation.

In most buildings we've investigated, the best solution to the complaints and listening to the people

talk about them, is not banning a single source but by looking entirely at the design, the operation, the maintenance and the proper methods of bringing standards into the ventilation system -- whether or not smoking is permitted in that building.

Our conclusion has been verified by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH, whose statistics you've heard earlier today.

Based on our practical experience, NEMI believes that workers in Maryland will be better served by enacting legislation that calls for a comprehensive review and appraisal of all airborne constituents, one that relies on effective ventilation system design, installation, operation and maintenance.

Our experience has led NEMI to believe that it's possible and practical to design and install ventilation systems that effectively isolate one area from another. This is done right now every day of the week in hospitals where you have to isolate those operating rooms from other areas of the building.

The state of the knowledge in ventilation system

design means that that can be done in the majority of 1 buildings in the state of Maryland. This has been 2 confirmed by the American Society of Heating, 3 Refrigerating, Air Conditioning Engineers, and their standards, ASHRAE Standard 62-1989, is rapidly becoming 5 accepted nationwide by the building code authorities 6 who have looked at this very seriously, and it's 7 currently the model for good indoor-air quality for 8 places from movie theaters to classrooms to hospitals.

Effective ventilation technology can be called upon to separate air flows so that one specific area does not mix with another. This is, again, one of the primary techniques that is advocated in writing by the Center for Disease Control to prevent the spread of tuberculosis.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Depending upon building design, this may involve only minor modifications to the ventilation system. In some cases, more changes are needed.

One example of this type of ventilation and with a project that NEMI was instrumental in completing, were the Blue Cross and Blue Shied Headquarters Building in

Detroit, Michigan, a health-related organization. Blue Cross and Blue Shield had a smoking ban in effect but changed it when we supervised the installation of an effective ventilation system for the smoking area of their employee cafeteria.

Based upon the ASHRAE standards, this project now allows their workers to choose whether or not to smoke in selected areas of the building.

Meanwhile, the proposal before us today calls for the ban of smoking in all areas, raises an important concern. Regulations of this type often limit the focus to one area instead of looking at the broader, more comprehensive solution.

For example, our office also work with the American Federation of Government Employees in the Social Security Administration Building in Richmond, California, where smoking had been banned for several years. We became involved after the outbreak of Legionnaire's Disease that killed two people in 1991 and rendered several other workers severely ill as a result of exposure to Legionnella bacteria.

Again, this was due to poor indoor air quality in a nonsmoking building.

These and other similar experiences have led us to conclude that banning smoking alone just often ignores the larger comprehensive problems of poor indoor air quality.

Again, it should be noted that OSHA, as you've heard, has issued their request for information this. I've personally met, along with several other members of our organization, with Joe Deere last week and I can assure you that an indoor air quality standard is very high on his agenda.

Finally, if, in fact, this Board decides to move forward with a proposed regulation, I would urge you to review the indoor air quality regulation currently being considered by Washington State Department of Labor and Industry. The proposed Washington State regulation drafted by an advisory board consisting of labor, industry and other interested parties, not only addresses smoking but also broadens the issue to a comprehensive indoor air quality issue in the

1 workplace.

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

NEMI supports the proposed Washington regulation and hopes that this delegation will consider this as a rational alternative.

In closing, I would like to confirm that NEMI is looking forward to working with you in developing legislation that will address effective ventilation strategies for the better indoor air quality.

Thank you. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

10 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any questions?

MR. QUIDAS: Do you use negative or positive pressure?

13 MR. WILLMAN: It will depend upon if you're inside 14 an area where you want to remove harmful air particulates, you want to have a negative system relative to the surrounding areas, so that the air moves from positive to negative and then out of the building.

MR. QUIDAS: You've got to have more than one duct.

MR. WILLMAN: You have to have -- as Mr. Wilford

explained, you want to have your buildings in a

positive ventilation mode. It's been confirmed by a

majority of the scientists who have looked at

ventilation strategies for buildings. Despite the fact

that we have an open door here, we're got lots of

outside air, most modern buildings if you go to ask

ventilation engineers, you want to keep that building

in a positive mode to a half inch of water gauge.

MR. QUIDAS: Now, the gentleman that was here earlier this morning said you used negative.

MR. WILLMAN: Well, I beg to differ with him.

MR. WILFORD: To give you another example on that, just like when you go into a hospital and you go to see your friend that's in that room, when you open that door, the air is going to stay -- go from the hallway into that room. You don't want those germs coming out of that room where the sick patient is out into the hallway.

So there's a negative pressure that the pressure is stronger in the hallway so when you open the door the air goes into that patient's room, not the reverse

because then you're going to put all the pollutants out into the hallway where everybody's going to breathe them.

б

This is an efficient way the building should operate because most of the cases, like they said about smoking is one thing, but how many people have been into a room where you've got that copy machine running all day and the fumes are about ready to gag you or the cleaning person has got the chemicals on the rugs or the curtains, or what have you?

There's so many other things that you've got to take and get the air out of the building and bring the fresh air in. When everybody was so energy conservation minded, they just shot off that fresh air coming in because it was too costly to heat it, and only thing they did was just recirculate over and over again that stale, smoked, diseased, fumes, carcinogenic, whatever.

What we need is a good indoor air quality program for everybody.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any other questions?

How much is it going to cost to put DR. deSILVA: 1 in the engineering changes that you are proposing? 2 A typical Baltimore row house that MR. WILLMAN: 3 has been now turned into a business, first of all, has to have an air conditioning system to provide the 5 thermal comfort that's needed by the people, not only who work there, but also the customers who come in. If 7 it is a typical retail type of operation with the door opening and closing many times during the day, the cost to modify that to meet the current ventilation 10 11 standards is going to be minimal. How minimal? 12 DR. deSILVA: 13 MR. WILLMAN: Probably in the order of a couple hundred dollars. 14 Say out in the rural areas something 15 DR. deSILVA: used in a residential home if it were being remodeled 16 17 for business use, how much would that cost?

MR. WILLMAN: There are now available air to air heat recovery devices that are being advocated. They are being mandated in Canada for use in new home construction that can, again, be installed in a

18

19

20

21

outlying home to bring in the necessary amount of outside air for \$200 to \$300. Honeywell produces these. Other major manufacturers produce these products that can bring in air from outside and exhaust the air from inside the building that then heats that air so you're not losing energy. You're bringing in outside air that is heated when it comes in.

MR. WILFORD: More or less it's like a timer that you would put like on your house. You want the lights to come on at a certain time, like if you were away and things like that. You know how they'll say that somebody's not home, but you just put a little timer, you plug it in. It makes the lights come on and turns them off.

Only thing you do is increase it. You increase the air change, but get the old air out and bring the clean air in. It's no more than putting a timer on to the thing in most cases.

DR. deSILVA: I'd be very interested in seeing those specifications.

MR. WILMAN: We can provide any information you

need.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you, gentlemen, very much.

MS. WEST: Clemis Kaikis. He's not here.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: After the next speaker we're going to take about five. Now, I don't mean seven, eight, nine or ten. We're going to take five to let everyone get up and kind of stretch at the table here and relieve themselves if they have to, but no more than five.

MS. WEST: I'm going to call on Daisy Jackson.

MS. JACKSON: Hi. Thank you for letting me speak.

I'm not here representing R. J. Reynolds, which is on your paper. I am representing myself, which is a small retail in the Baltimore City, and I'm not going to rehash what the small business peoples have already told you. I am on accord with them.

So what I am saying is that I agree with them, and I hope that you don't go with this policy banning cigarette smoke because we are a group of small businesses and I represent them in the city of

Baltimore and that's our livelihood. We are legal, and 1 I hope that you consider to give us a chance not to ban 2 smoking in the workplace because I do not smoke, but some of my employees, but I require for them to go outside to smoke, so I am saying that maybe we can 5 educate, do more educating our people to either stop or 6 cut back. 7 So on my behalf, thank you for letting me speak, 8 but I am with the group of the retail, small business 9 10 people. Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you, Mrs. Jackson. 12 Anyone have any questions? 13 Let's take a quick five and we'll be right back. 14 (Whereupon a short recess was taken and the 15 hearing was then resumed.) 16 17 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you. We'll now 18 reconvene. We're ready to proceed with the hearing. 19 Ms. West. MS. WEST: I'm not sure if this person is here. 20 21 Jolanda Janczewski.

DR. JANCZEWSKI: Good afternoon. I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to come and speak with you today.

As you heard, my name is Dr. Jolanda Janczewski. I am president of Consolidated Safety Services, Inc., which is a safety and occupational health consulting firm that provides services to help resolve occupational, trans-portation and public safety and health issues.

Our corporation conducts on-site inspections, training and programmatic evaluations for clients throughout the United States, including U.S. government entities such as the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration and OSHA.

As part of our services, we conduct indoor air quality evaluations and design remediation strategies. We are based in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area with our headquarters in Oakton, Virginia, and operating centers throughout the United States.

I'm here today to speak to you from three

perspectives. First, as a career occupational safety and health specialist. Second, as an owner of an indoor air quality evaluation firm. And, third, as an owner of a private business.

I have been working in the area of occupational safety and health for over 16 years and I base my career on providing safe and healthful work places for our nation's employees. In addition, I have a Ph. D. in environmental health and public policy, which provides me with particular expertise in evaluating public policy and its relation to sound, scientific evidence.

On this note, I am concerned that your total proposed smoking ban does lack sufficient scientific evidence from which to form its basis. Although the EPA's report on ETS, as well as other government studies, have addressed second-hand smoke, as we've seen today, these reports fail to provide us with the data needed for establishing polices in workplaces.

While personal opinions on the issue of smoking may want to guide all of us in one direction,

occupational safety and health standards must be
carefully guided by unemotional, scientific
foundations, using public or personal opinions to drive
public policy has gotten us all into a lot of trouble,
and it's recognizably dangerous as it does set a
precedent for overregulation and needlessly expensive
and ineffective solutions.

The current data available for the risks associated with ETS in the workplace is lacking at this time. It would, therefore, be prudent to provide OSHA with sufficient time for conducting research on the subject. It is important, also, to recognize that as we've heard today, OSHA has identified the need to address ETS in the workplace, but under the broader context of improvement of indoor air quality.

As an expert in evaluating indoor air quality problems, I do not disagree with OSHA's approach, as it speaks to a systems approach for reducing or eliminating the myriad of contaminants produced in an indoor environment.

As data from NIOSH has shown, as well as a variety

of other research studies, and as well as one that we had conducted in 1988 for AFGE, ETS represents less than 3 percent of the total indoor contaminant problems.

So it really makes no sense to expend such great efforts to eliminate a relatively minute part of the problem while you're virtually ignoring the broader issue.

Substantial research as well as indoor air standards published by ASHRAE do support that adequate ventilation is sufficient in reducing all indoor air contaminants to acceptable levels.

If your intent here is to improve indoor air quality, it would certainly be wiser and more effective to propose standards for adequately designed, operated and maintained ventilation systems in all work places.

As the gentleman from NEMI had just mentioned earlier, if you'll take a look at the Washington state bill that they're having the hearings this week about, I think you could see a real good bill that would address the broader issue, and including ETS.

Now, as an owner of a private business I am concerned with how such standards as those you propose will adversely affect my employees. Although we do not currently have an operating center in Maryland, we do have one in Pennsylvania in Virginia and we are currently considering putting one in Maryland. But I will tell you that if your standard does pass, I will not move an office into Maryland and I will not hire employees in this state.

It is my experience that total smoking bans, while doing little to improve the overall quality of indoor air, also cause additional problems. Our corporate staff, for instance, in our office in Virginia houses a number of employees who smoke. Since we have provided individual offices for all of our employees, our policy has been to restrict smoking to specific offices.

I am concerned, therefore, that we, as a private employer in the state of Maryland, would not have the right to establish such policies as we see best for our individual employee populations.

By eliminating smoking in the workplace as well as

our options, such as the policy that we've chosen in our office, I think that larger problems could arise.

For example, the nature of our business calls quite often for my employees to work long nights on projects or proposals. Currently, many of these employees work late hours into the week hours of the morning. By permitting these employees to smoke in their office, their productivity, their job satisfaction and my return on the labor investment remains very high.

However, should I have to force these employees to leave the building to smoke, I can assure you that not only will their productivity and morale drop, but it will certainly directly affect their willingness to work the long hours that are needed on the job.

Most importantly, I will be extremely concerned with the security of my employees, especially those who are female, who have to stand in a dark parking lot late at night to smoke when I have no way to insure their safety or their security.

As has been discussed, moving a smoking employee

to an area directly outside an entrance can also cause a problem for my nonsmoking employees, and also I certainly do have better things to do with my time than to try to monitor my smoking work staff or nonsmoking work staff in the state of Maryland if I place an office here.

Since I neither condone nor condemn the legal personal habits of my employees, they are assured that they are all equally valuable in my eyes. Those employees who do smoke are just as important to my company as those who do not. And so I have appreciated as a private employer having the right to address the needs of both sides of this issue through a policy which meets the needs of my entire work force.

Although I applaud any effort which seeks to improve the occupational environment, I would ask that you consider all those sides which have been addressed today and keep in mind that before establishing policies which have such widespread impact that it is much more important to get it right than to get it fast.

Thank you. 1 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any questions? 2 Thank you for your comments. 3 MS. WEST: Maureen Lamb. MS. LAMB: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members 5 6 of the Committee. I am Maureen Lamb. I am vice chair of the Anne Arundel County Council. 7 I commend you all for taking on an issue which I 8 have been with for the last six years and which is the 9 most controversial issue that I've experienced in 10 almost 12 years as a county legislator. 11 I'm here to support the proposal to ban smoking in 12 all public and private workplaces in Maryland through 13 14 regulation. For the past six years, I have worked to get 15 legislation passed which would protect the nonsmoker 16 17 from the hazards of cigarette smoke. I submitted legislation six years ago to ban smoking in public 18 19 The response of the public was overwhelmingly 20 in support of the legislation, but the ordinance did

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. 974-0947

21

not pass.

This year I again wrote legislation which would ban smoking in public places, including malls and workplaces with more than 50 employees, unless a designated smoking area with a ventilation system that prevents air in the smoking area from passing into nonsmoking areas.

I have brought with me a copy of the legislation which finally passed. It was a hard-fought battle, and the end result was only achieved by amending a piece of legislation brought forth by my colleagues, who intended to give an impression of meeting the demands of the public for protection but which in actuality did next to nothing to protect the public from second-hand smoke.

I mention this only because I want to impress upon you the need for state regulations which will provide a smoke-free environment for employees of the entire state. Getting legislation through county governments is extremely time-consuming. It's fraught with problems stemming from lobbyists with unlimited resources and business organizations which will use all

of their political clout to prevent any legislation from passing.

It was my experience that these organizations sometimes acted without polling their members.

The citizens of this state are entitled to a workplace that is safe from the health dangers caused by breathing second-hand smoke. It is my understanding that there is a growing volume of court cases and legal opinions regarding exposure to ETS in the workplace that indicate that there is no legal right to smoke, and that employees have a right under common law to sue for a smoke-free work environment.

I was very surprised and pleased to have many businesses call my office and support my legislation. Several requested that there be no designated area required in the bill. They said it was costly to them in terms of time away from work, additional maintenance, and insurance cost to the company incurred by the employee who smokes and develops smoke-related illnesses.

Every smoker costs his or her company at least

\$1,000 a year because of the decreased productivity and increased health care cost. These businesses preferred a total ban over requiring a designated smoking area.

In addition, businesses have made it clear to me that they would like a total state ban because it gives everybody in every county a level playing field.

In conclusion, it has been my experience after six years of pushing legislation at the county level that, one, the public supports a smoke-free workplace. By far, the majority of businesses, small and large, support a total smoking ban in preference to allowing smoking in designated areas.

The cost of allowing smoking in the workplace is expensive to the employer, the employee, the county and the citizens in the state of Maryland.

I urge the state to ban smoking in the workplace so that all employers in the state of Maryland will be required to provide a smoke-free environment for their employees.

And I thank you very much and I'd be glad to answer questions.

MR. LAWSON: You mentioned overwhelming businesses that have requested and have public support for a complete ban on smoking. Does your office have any statistics on the number of responses that have come in that you can provide to the Board?

MS. LAMB: I would say that individual businesses who have called my office, yes, I have a record of

who have called my office, yes, I have a record of those. The majority of the response against the legislation came from organizations such as the Trade Council, but it was surprising to me that they did come in, many of these organizations came in, and when they were questioned they did not -- they had not polled their businesses.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any other questions? Thank you.

MS. LAMB: You're welcome.

MS. WEST: Mr. Edward Dreiband.

MR. DREIBAND: Hello. My name is Edward Dreiband.

I'm with Northwest Honda. I'm the owner. And I can
only give you our own experience. We purchased a
dealership six years ago. We have 53 employees. We

have a smoke-free environment.

We established it, started it four years ago. We first tried to find a segregated area in our dealership and we really couldn't find a place to segregate the smokers from the nonsmokers, so we spent \$3,000 to purchase a smoke eater, which is supposed to have taken care of the problem, and it didn't take care of the problem.

So we decided three years ago to eliminate smoking throughout the dealership. We did so and we had the participation of all the employees of our company, smokers and nonsmokers, and if I were to ask any one of them to come up here, smokers or nonsmokers, they would tell you that it has helped them in their health. We have fewer health claims than we had before. We have more productive employees. Our customers are much happier. We have customers who are always coming over to us and complimenting us for not having smoking.

They appreciate not having cigarette ashes in their cars. They appreciate not having the smoke in the waiting areas. They appreciate not walking into a

dealership and not having smoking in the sales area.

This year we were awarded the master of customer satisfaction and we are proud of that, and one of the ways that is established is Honda sends out a questionnaire to customers and in that questionnaire asks about the environment in the dealership. And fortunately we have a very clean environment and the people appreciate it, and that's one of the reasons we won.

So that's our experience, and we really have no problems at all other than the benefits of not smoking in our environment and our employees are happy.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you. Any questions?

MR. QUIDAS: Did those persons that were smokers,

did they stop completely or did they stop at work?

MR. DREIBAND: We have -- well, when we started,

we had many smokers. Now, we have five people out of

53 that smoke in the whole dealership, so many of them

have stopped altogether, and they're a lot happier.

They've told me that. I mean, I went around today and asked them, just several of them that I knew that

smoked and who don't smoke now and they're much happier. And had I -- it would have been much easier, I think, had I -- there was a law, if there had been a law stating that you can't smoke in the business rather than us having to tell them they're not going to smoke. MR. QUIDAS: How about the five or six that still 6 7 smoke? MR. DREIBAND: They smoke in the outside and they're not -- they don't complain about it. In fact, 9 10 they under --Is their attitude --11 MR. QUIDAS: They have a very good attitude. MR. DREIBAND: 12 They understand. They understand because we're very 13 customer oriented company and they understand that, and 14 they want to sell cars and they want to service the 15 cars, and our customers appreciate it, so therefore, 16 they appreciate it. There is no problem that we have 17

MR. NOBILE: Do you think the system that you ended up with and those particular employees going outside to take a smoke break, that you're better off

18

19

20

21

anyway.

where you ended up than if, in fact, the smoke ventilation system would have worked? Because you can almost visualize what would have happened if the ventilation system in that room that you said you tried to create would have worked. Do you think you're better off now or with the ventilated system?

MR. DREIBAND: Right now. It's much better right now. I mean, it's cleaner. We don't have -- our cleaning is -- it's cheaper to clean our dealership because we don't have smoke all over the place, the aftereffects of that. It's just nicer. The whole environment is nicer. I don't like smoking myself, but -- in case you didn't notice it.

MR. NOBILE: I've got another question for you.

Do you forbid prospective buyers to smoke when they

come into your dealership?

MR. DREIBAND: Yes. We have a sign as you come in the dealership saying that we'd like to protect the environment of our -- I don't remember the exact wording, but it's something to the effect that we try to protect the environment. We appreciate you not

smoking.

And we have not had one problem in three years that we've done this.

MR. NOBILE: Okay, that was my other question. Okay.

MR. DREIBAND: We have had compliments, including the people that smoke.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir.

MS. WEST: Sharon Breedlove.

MS. BREEDLOVE: Good afternoon. My name is Sharon Breedlove and I live in Clarksville.

I come before you today to compliment your progressive commitment to achieve a smoke-free environment for all Maryland workers but also to urge you to please put teeth and muscle into the penalties for violating standards you are currently considering.

As a registered nurse who works in a Maryland hospital, I have a unique perspective on the problem before you, and I'm also an asthmatic since diagnosis in 1986, I have had little difficulty in controlling the asthma until January of this year. My home

environment has always been smoke-free. The mitigating factor triggering an acute asthmatic episode has always been exposure to smoke.

The lack of regulation of smoking makes it impossible for any worker to obtain coverage from an employer, employer's Workmen's Comp insurance, for medical consequences after workplace exposure to smoke.

Not too long ago I attended an in-service training session right outside my own hospital building and a fellow employee proceeded to smoke. I felt myself starting to wheeze and I had to ask this coworker three times before she would put out the cigarette.

This mandatory session demanded my physical presence and this is just one of the many scenarios facing workers in this state.

I have faced many similar dilemmas with frightening regularity. Every single time I have been exposed to smoke on the job, my peak flow, which is a measure of lung capacity, has dropped precipitously. I have had to start another round of medications and been too sick to work for a week or more. I even got

admitted once for an asthmatic episode that over the course of six hours could not be broken.

Again, my point, it is not enough to enact tough regulations although it is a step in the right direction. Penalties need to sting to encourage management of any business to enforce these regulations strictly. The proposed regulations may address the problem of smoking in the workplace but without equal aggressiveness in the realm of reenforcement and penalty for violations by Maryland businesses, your noble efforts are going to be fruitless.

In conclusion, I tell smoking rights advocates please take note, your smoke shuts down my lungs and really tramples on my right to breath and my right to work.

Thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you very much.

Any questions?

Thank you. And may I say to all of those who have waited this long to make your presentation, I would like to congratulate you on having the fortitude to

stay here and withstand the time spent in order to have your say.

Ms. West.

MS. WEST: Lori Rhoads.

MS. RHOADS: My name is Lori Rhoads. I currently live in Columbia, Maryland. I've prepared a written statement which is being passed out now. In addition, I have included doctors' statements which I provided to my company over the course of five years outlining my medical condition and I've also included with that copies of no-smoking regulations passed by Montgomery. County, my company, and the resolution Trust Corporation.

I'm going to skip over a portion of the prepared statement simply out of respect for the time of day and the weariness of the people here. I am here to relate to you how important this regulation would be to individuals like me who have suffered immensely from a company's calloused attitude for employee welfare.

I was employed by Standard Federal Savings Bank in September of 1987. By December of 1987 I required

medical treatment for an upper respiratory infection due to cigarette smoke in the workplace.

Since that time, I have become increasingly ill whenever exposed to cigarette smoke at Standard Federal, suffering from sinus infections, upper respiratory infections, bronchitis, pneumonia and chronic migraine headaches.

This company never took an active role in monitoring cigarette smoke in the workplace. Even after Montgomery County passed a no-smoking ban in early 1990, smoking continued in my office, even after the landlord mandated no smoking in the building, smoking continued in my office. Even after the bank itself instituted a company-wide no smoking policy, smoking continued in my office.

Literally nothing could compel management to enforce the smoking ban, despite the very visible damage to my health and the numerous physician statements attesting to my need for a smoke-free working environment. In fact, it was senior managers who were the primary violators of the no smoking

policy. I repeatedly requested the existing policies be enforced or I be moved to an area where the smoking ban was not so cavalierly ignored.

Management's tactics was to make me out to be a malcontent. The human resources department continuously asked me to obtain physician statements attesting to my predisposition to asthma only to ignore them and do nothing about the smoking. The more I protested, the more I was harassed.

When I finally developed pneumonia and was unable to work due to a cracked rib from coughing, I threatened not to return to the office until I was moved away from the smoking. This strategy worked until the bank was taken over by the Resolution Trust Corporation in October 1992. On the day the bank was placed in conservatorship, approximately 75 Resolution Trust Corporation and Office of Thrift Supervision agents entered the building. Despite clearly posted no-smoking signs in the lobby and other public areas of the building, large groups of these individuals would congregate to smoke openly.

Finally, after several days of suffocating smoke, I approached the intervention manager with the complaints of numerous Standard Federal employees. I informed him of the county ban on smoking and I asked him to direct his staff to comply with the law.

The RTC agreed to stop smoking in communal areas, but refused to stop smoking in private offices. Even after the building manager sent several letters to the managing agent to request the smoking stop, the RTC officials refused to stop smoking.

Finally, after months of suffering with bronchitis, pneumonia and severe migraine headaches, I confronted the violators face-to-face and pleaded with them to stop smoking in the building. One RTC official responsible for the smoke told me that in consideration for my health, he would attempt to refrain from smoking in the building, but he would not promise not to smoke on occasion.

At that point, I informed my supervisor the company's inability to provide me with a smoke-free environment left me with no other alternative but to

work at home. In August 1993 I was requested to report back to work in another building located in Frederick.

The Frederick Building had a limited smoking ban which designated separate smoking areas in closed-door, hard-walled offices. Unfortunately, even this limited smoking ban was not enforced by senior management.

Again, senior managers were the primary violators of the policy and nothing was done to reprimand them for their behavior.

A full smoking ban was scheduled to take effect in the Frederick office on September 1, but, given management's lack of concern for enforcing the policies of the past, I felt it was unlikely this policy would carry any weight. While in the Frederick office on August 12, I was instructed by the senior vice president of human resources to either report to work the following Monday in Frederick or to go on disability leave.

I indicated my willingness to report to Frederick after the no-smoking ban was in place. I also said I would remain in the office only as long as the no-

smoking policy was enforced. I pointed out that as we spoke the current policy was being violated by a senior manager in the next office. If the new policy did not curb the smoking, I could not work in that office.

As a result of exposure to cigarette smoke during that meeting, I became very ill and required medical treatment for an asthma attack and emergency medical treatment for severe migraine headache.

On September 15, 1993, I was fired from Standard Federal, ostensibly for failing to report to work in the Frederick office. However, I had supplied the company with several physician statements attesting to my incapacity to report to work as a result of exposure to smoke in the workplace. In addition, I had accrued over 45 days of combined sick leave and vacation time which I was not allowed to use to recuperate from my illness.

The company had pressured me to go on disability leave, but when I tried to use my earned leave for a documented illness, I was fired after 10 days absence.

I'm running out of breath.

During the five years I was employed at Standard Federal, I was consistently recognized as an outstanding employee. My salary more than tripled and I was highly interactive with senior management. Yet when I tried to have existing no smoking policies enforced, I was told over and over again the company was not responsible for the behavior of grown men and nothing could be done to force someone to stop smoking.

I could not compel the company to enforce its own policies and I could find no one at the city, county or state level who was willing to require the company to enforce the county code. I was told of loopholes and incongruities, of red tape and lack of jurisdiction.

Meanwhile, my health got worse and worse.

I suffered through months of incapacitation as a result of severe headaches triggered by exposure to cigarette smoke. For weeks I would not set foot outside. I could not eat, watch television, or read a book. I was a prisoner in my own home and I was in continuous pain.

Even after the RTC intervened, the violations

continued despite the RTC's own directives stating, quote, "It is the policy of the RTC as part of its responsibility to provide a safe and healthy workplace to ban smoking within all RTC-owned and leased facilities."

It further directs employees and visitors to "voluntarily and courteously comply with the requirements outlined in this policy. It is the obligation of all employees to be mindful and considerate of their coworkers."

Not only does this case illustrate management's lack of concern for employee welfare, it also demonstrates how individuals can be threatened and harassed simply for standing for what they are entitled to, namely a safe place to work.

I want to say at this time I am still recovering from illnesses brought on by smoke in the workplace. I've been given numerous medications ranging from injections to inhalants to pills in order to try to relieve me of my illnesses.

I have the same lung disease as my 75-year-old

1 grandfather. This is outrageous. 2 To depart a little bit from the prepared testimony, smoking does not -- is not a right 3 guaranteed by our Constitution or Bill of Rights. Anybody who says that they have a right to smoke is 5 misinformed. People have a right to breathe, okay? 7 This regulation is a must to protect people like me from harassment from employers who refuse to enforce their own policies, and it is imperative that we as 10 individuals, not as coalitions or small business owners 11 or people who don't have a lot of power, have a place. 12 to go to have these policies enforced. 13 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you. 14 Any questions? 15 We thank you. Ms. West? 16 17 MS. WEST: Is there still a Kevin Spurrior in the audience? No? 18 19 Is there an Anthony Marquart? 20 MR. MARQUART: I'm Tony Marquart, and I'm representing myself, a private citizen. 21 I am a smoker.

I represent, I guess, 20 or 25 percent of those people who are not part of the overwhelming support for banning smoking as the one lady alluded to.

But the reason I wanted to ask the gentleman from NSA a question is that I was a former employee of NSA when the smoking ban was initiated, and I opposed that ban, since I am a smoker, and I was very actively involved as a part of the administration directorate in knowing what was going on.

That ban was done by executive fiat. That ban —
there were no employees who were solicited. I
ultimately with a small group went up to the director
of our agency and apprised him of this that you should
consider the needs of the interests of that 25 roughly
percent of the work force who does smoke. And there
was no response to that.

And the response ultimately from our director was that if you don't like it, you can leave.

Now, that's consideration for the needs of 25 percent of your work force, and when he alluded to the fact or he stated that there was no -- people were not

upset about that, well, they didn't ask employees. If you didn't comply, you were gone.

My point is that there has to be some accommodation to meet the needs, reasonable accommodation to meet the needs of those people who do smoke and who are addicted or whatever you want to call it in medical psychological terms.

There was none in our case, and that's what I'm afraid of with a ban like this that there will be no accommodation at all. We ought to explore -- there is technology out there. The gentleman talked in the venting business -- there is some technology to get all of it out of the building, set an area aside, allow for the needs of those people who wish to smoke, allow for those.

I consider it inhumane treatment to be forced outside -- I really do -- in miserable damn weather. I mean, if it's raining, sleeting, snowing, 105 degrees, I'm forced out there if I want to smoke, and that's inhumane. We treat our pets better than that.

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: 1 Thank you, sir. Any other speakers? 2 S. J. Schultz? Earl Hanes? 3 MS. WEST: 4 CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Is there anyone here who 5 thinks they signed up and their name hasn't been called? 7 MS. WEST: Mr. Wright, Mr. William Wright, it's 8 your turn. 9 MR. WRIGHT: I was up to 6:00 this morning 10 preparing this so I didn't want to miss my turn this 11 afternoon. 12 All that you've heard today about the harms of 13 tobacco smoke, it's really worse than what you've heard 14 so far. I have a letter that I got from Philip Morris 15 back in 1976 as a result of a letter to them asking for a list of ingredients of compounds that they had 16 17 advertised in a full-page ad where they said there was 18 2,000 compounds in smoke. 19 And I wrote them a letter asking for this list. 20 The fellow didn't send me the list, but in his letter 21 he says there's over 6,000 compounds in tobacco smoke.

4 U.S.

The EPA report on page 3-2, says that the agency has identified 4,000.

So everything you've heard is understated by a third.

In this letter, they mention a report that was produced for the Department of Agriculture. I have submitted that for you. It does not list the 6,000 chemicals with your scientist type people they should be able to tell you something about all these chemicals that are listed here.

what you have to keep in mind, if I may suggest, is that tobacco smoke is not one carcinogenic substance. It is a compound of hundreds of cancer-causing chemicals, and then you start dealing with the synergistic effect of these chemicals in our body, and then you consider the chemicals that are in our food acting synergistically with the smoke that we breathe, and then you add to that the chemicals that are in our water that act synergistically with all these other compounds.

So then you think you're safe and you go outside

to breathe fresh air. Well, as you know, the Baltimore metropolitan area is an acid air metropolitan area. Those chemicals interact synergistically with all these other chemicals that are in the smoke and that are in our water.

One of the biggest concerns of the people that I've been dealing with in trying to get prohibition in Howard County and Baltimore County and with the government when I was there deals with restaurants.

I've obtained a copy of a report that was in July 28, '93, and basically it says that people who work in bars and restaurants have a 50 percent greater chance of getting lung cancer than employees in other smoke environments that are not restaurant or bar oriented.

I've also provided for you, and you probably have it because I've heard it mentioned a couple times today, is Governor Schaefer's executive order. I would hope that you would take some of the language out of here and incorporate it into your regulation. The one half sheet of paper that I've seen doesn't really describe what the problems are and what the employee is

supposed to get.

Now, in the article that was in Mr. Fogle's proclamation it said the employee is going to be prohibited from smoking. That is only part of the problem. You also have to protect that employee from smoke that may come from another employers area in a multi-employer building with a common ventilation system.

You also have to protect that person from the public who may come in and want to smoke. I have suggested language to you that would deal with a single employer, single building situation. Here, again, it would be totally prohibited except in a separately ventilated, floor-to-ceiling room type area with a door and then, again, the air would be drawn into that room not out.

When you have a multi-employer single building situation, my suggestion is that the owner of the building prohibit in the common areas each employer prohibit and then again establish a smoking area within that building separately ventilated and with the door

and ventilation that would keep the smoke there.

One of the biggest problems I've seen, especially at the mall at Westview, they don't have any signs up on the doors. A lot of people who aren't keeping track of all this stuff like some of us do don't really realize that the mall now is a smoke-free mall because the signs aren't up or because you can see through them and they really aren't drawn to your attention, people come in and smoke.

I've also provided to you a copy of Judge Murphy's order prohibiting smoking in the Court system of Maryland. I've also given you a memo I don't think anybody else has anymore; it's dated December 10, 1985, and was issued by the Attorney General's Office, and it's a three-and-a-half page letter to the Clerk of the Court, in Carroll County where they wanted to prohibit smoking out there.

It is a good outline of cases that support the prohibition and the conclusion then of the Attorney General back in '85 was, one, that no one has a right to smoke and that there is a legal basis for the

prohibition which would be substantiated by the Court system.

I'd also like to address some of the comments that have happened today.

Usually when the tobacco lobby goes to these hearings on the county and state level in the counties they say let's make it a statewide ban; hold off, don't do anything. They go to the state hearings and they say it should be a county-controlled legislation, don't do anything.

Today they're telling you don't make it a statewide legislation; wait for the national government to do something.

And I can bet you when OSHA comes up for their hearings they're going to say don't do anything, wait until the United Nations does something.

(Laughter.)

MR. WRIGHT: I mean, it just goes on and on. I've been involved with this stuff for 20 years. The legislatures of the county and state levels have abandoned us as nonsmokers who have a concern for our

health.

If they had at the state level done the things we wanted years ago, possibly the three men that burned alive back in October may be alive today. If you don't take an action prohibiting smoking in the work area, you're going to have more incidents like the one that you had.

You know, we can come down here, intellectualize about this stuff all day, and a lot of us do it whenever we get a chance, hoping that we can persuade the health authorities to do something for us. But where the bottom line is, is in the hospitals, in doctor's offices, treating people who have lung cancer or treating the people who carry the oxygen tanks around.

Now, I know these people here from the tobacco industry and people who smoke make fun of us, and that's okay because eventually they're going to pay the fee of their desire to smoke. When those three men died, we didn't hear their screams, and you today don't hear the thousands of Marylanders like this lady over

here, wherever she is, have to daily deal with the problems of smoke.

When I was with the government, we had a large room with 200 some people in it. It would just lay in the room. I react three different ways to smoke. The cigarette smoke, it like takes my breath away. It's like a light, burning sensation.

Is that it? Okay? Thank you. Appreciate.

MR. NOBILE: I take it that three people you're talking about are the custodians that were --

MR. WRIGHT: That's the ones that are in the article, yes.

MR. NOBILE: Well, you've got to remember one thing about that. They had warning labels on all those containers. They had standard operating procedures associated with using that product, and all of the safety features were ignored by the people that were doing it. So I'm not really sure that your statement is accurate that they could still be alive today. They may not be smoking, but certainly that's the reason why it happened. They ignored safety precautions and just

totally disregarded it -- in all fairness.

MR. WRIGHT: In all fairness to your comments, do you know as a fact if the employer told them do not smoke on the job when you are fooling with this type of chemical? Do you know that?

MR. NOBILE: They had warning labels on all the containers from what I understand.

MR. WRIGHT: Well, most people, if they're like me, the last thing you read are the instructions, and I have a feeling these people didn't read them either. They shake the container up, they pour it in the buckets and do whatever they're going to do with it, but they don't read it. And I have a feeling though, sir, if the employer, all employers tell people who deal with these chemicals that you are not to smoke from now until the time you get back, they won't, and shouldn't.

And it's a shame that these three men had to die to bring your Board together for Mr. Fogle to make a decision when we've been out here for 20 years, at least 20 years, trying to get protection for us.

1	CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Any further questions?
2	Thank you, sir.
3	MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.
4	MS. WEST: Lawrence Miller?
5	CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Let me ask this. Is there
6	anyone else in the audience who signed up?
7	MR. BEREANO: Just that Delegate George Owens of
8	Calvert County was here later after you'd called his
9	name. He just wanted to tell you that he was here.
10	He's going to submit a letter for the record.
11	CHAIRMAN MARSHALL: Thank you very much.
12	There being no further persons to speak, I would
13	like to thank everyone for coming and providing
14	comments on the regulations.
15	The Board has scheduled a second hearing next week
16	on December 16 in Frederick to assure accessibility to
17	the Board by citizens in the western part of our state.
18	Those of you in the eastern and northern can come as
19	well.
20	Testimony that we heard today will become a part
21	of the record and will be considered by the Board in

CERTIFICATE

2

5

1

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: MOSH ADVISORY BOARD HEARING

Prohibiting Smoking in the Workplace

6 BEFORE:

Chairman Marshall

7 DATE:

December 9, 1993

8 PLACE:

Crownsville, Maryland

9 represents the full and complete proceedings of the 10 aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to 11 typewriting.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Drita Sernstein,
Breta Bernstein,
Court Reporter

Cheryl Battles, Ki